

120555

NINTH CIA CAREER COUNCIL MEETING

COC	2	REV DATE	8/06/81	BY	018995
ORIG COMP	=	OPI	32	TYPE	01
ORIG CLASS	5	PAGES	12	REV CLASS	5
JUST	22	NEXT REV	2011	AUTH:	NR 78-2

9th Meeting

~~SECRET~~  
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CIA CAREER COUNCIL

10th Meeting

[ JOINT CAREER COUNCIL - SELECTION BOARD MEETING ]

Thursday, 19 May 1955

DCI Conference Room  
Administration Building

Present

Harrison G. Reynolds, Director of Personnel  
Chairman of CIA Career Council and CIA Selection Board

25X1A9a

[ ] Chief, PP Staff  
Member, CIA Selection Board

George G. Carey, Assistant Director for Operations  
Member, CIA Selection Board

Sheffield Edwards, Director of Security  
Guest

Otto E. Guthe, Assistant Director for Research and Reports  
Member, CIA Selection Board

25X1A9a

[ ] Chief of Operations, DD/P  
Alternate Member, CIA Career Council

Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, Inspector General  
Member, CIA Career Council

25X1A9a

[ ] Director of Communications  
Member, CIA Career Council and CIA Selection Board

25X1A9a

Edward R. Saunders, Comptroller  
Member, CIA Selection Board

[ ], Chief, Inspection & Review Staff  
Guest

25X1A9a

[ ] Deputy Director of Training  
Alternate Member, CIA Career Council

25X1A9a

[ ] Chief, FI Staff  
Member, CIA Selection Board

John R. Tietjen, Chief, Medical Staff  
Member, CIA Selection Board

25X1A9a

Lawrence K. White, Deputy Director (Support)  
Member, CIA Career Council

[ ] Assistant to DD/I (Admin)  
Alternate Member, CIA Career Council

25X1A9a

[ ]  
Executive Secretary, CIA Career Council, and  
Executive Director, CIA Selection Board

25X1A9a

[ ]  
Reporter

~~SECRET~~  
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

. . . . The 10th meeting of the CIA Career Council [Joint Career Council - Selection Board] convened at 4:00 p.m., Thursday, 19 May 1955, in the DCI Conference Room, Administration Building, with Mr. Harrison G. Reynolds presiding . . . .

MR. REYNOLDS: The meeting will come to order.

We have invited the members of the Selection Board today. The agenda contains the question. However, prior to our discussing the question, are there any changes, errors or omissions in the minutes of the meeting of 12 May of the Career Council, held in this room? If not, they stand approved.

The next item on the agenda is the proposed procedural changes concerning the method of processing applications for membership in the Career Staff. You have all been given another sheet of paper, which has been provided by the Executive Secretary, which shows the number of cases handled to date, and the number over which there was some controversy.

. . . . The conferees were then given a few minutes to read the following paper:

Summary of Actions by  
Examining Panels and CIA Selection Board

Total cases acted on to date by Board:	1406
Cases in which Panels agreed with Career Services and Board agreed with Panels and with Career Services:	<u>1380</u>
Cases in which Panels did not agree with Career Services or the Board did not agree with Career Service and/or the Panels:	26

Following is an analysis of the 26 cases.

<u>Panel Recommendation</u>	<u>No. of Cases</u>	<u>Board Action</u>
Type A	1	Board reversed Panel in one case (Type A to Type B)
Type A to Type B	17	Board agreed with Panels in 11 cases; restored Type A status in 5 cases; and took more drastic action (Type B to Type C) in one case.
Type A to Type C	2	Board agreed with Panels in one case; and took intermediate position (Type C to Type B) in one.
Type B to Type A	4	Board agreed with Panels in 3 cases; and reversed Panel (Type A to Type B) in one.
Type B to Type C	<u>2</u>	Board agreed with Panels in both cases.
	<u>26</u>	

	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Total cases acted on to date by the Board:	1406	100.00

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~~~SECRET~~

	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Cases in which Panels agreed with Career Services and Board agreed with Panels and Career Services:	<u>1380</u>	<u>98.15</u>
Cases in which Panels did not agree with Career Services or the Board did not agree with Career Service and/or the Panels:	26	1.85
Cases in which Board agreed with Panels and disagreed with Career Services:	17	1.21
Cases in which Board agreed with Career Services and disagreed with Panels:	6	.43
Cases in which Board took more drastic action than recommended by either Panels or Career Services:	2	.14
Cases in which Board took more drastic action than recommended by Career Service and less drastic action than recommended by Panels:	<u>1</u>	<u>.07</u>
	26	1.85

MR. REYNOLDS: I presume everybody has digested this now, in a preliminary way, at least.

Will you, Kirk, be good enough to start the discussion, inasmuch as the subject was originally brought up by you?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I raised this matter at the meeting of the Career Council last week because I am of the opinion that we are in or are getting close to a matter of double jeopardy as far as employees are concerned, on the basis that we have been operating in the past with the seven so-called "offices of record" providing information to the Selection Board or Examining Panel, whichever is appropriate. I pointed out that in one instance--actually, two employees were involved--I prepared a memorandum to the Director of Personnel and sent a representative to the Selection Panel to discuss these two individuals. But after reviewing the procedure involved therein, I came to the conclusion I would not do that anymore, for the following reasons: In the first place, I think any information in the files of the Inspector General--and I am speaking only for my Staff but I think it relates very directly to the other six--should be made available to the Head of the Career Service or the Operating Component--usually the same individual--at the time of the original "crime" or "sin", and that the action then taken by the Head of that Career Service/Operating Component should be a fairly decisive factor in determining the future of that individual. To be very specific, if I recommend to the Head of an Operating Component that disciplinary action be taken, and he determines he doesn't

~~SECRET~~~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

want to take disciplinary action and that there should be no mark on the employee's record, I don't think it either fair or appropriate at a later date for me to re-raise the issue with an Examining Panel, and that there should be no jeopardy to the individual becoming a member of the Career Service, because if at the time of the original action I felt strongly enough about it, concerning the individual--I have a perfect right to carry it as high as the Director. If I fail to do that, then I think that it is, once again, the Head of the Operating Component's right to take the action and make it stick. If I do carry it as high as the Director, then it becomes a matter of record as far as the individual is concerned.

So, the point I am making is this: I think the way this procedure should be modified, rather than as we have done with the 1408 cases thus far, with these seven offices solicited for views on individuals after they had been approved by their appropriate Career Services, that any action taken by these seven offices should be before the individual is nominated up from the Career Service to the Selection Board, and that that is where these offices of record should make their weight felt. I think basically the way we have been doing it in the past, while ensuring a cross-Agency examination and review by non-interested parties, is fine, but as I have stated, I don't intend to make available to any Selection Board or Examining Panel information in the IG's files. If the Head of the Operating Component or the Head of the Career Service wants to pass on anything that came from my files and has been given to him, he has a perfect right to, but I think I am violating both the confidence of the employee, and, also, a confidence of the Operating Component, to pass information on individuals to a group which is not specifically under his command. If he says he wants to do it himself, that is up to him. That is why I raised this issue, with the suggestion that we stop where we are on the selection system and review it, and see if we can't do it so there won't be what I call, for lack of a better expression, a case of "double jeopardy."

There is a second aspect that came to my attention almost simultaneously with my sending information over to the Selection Board, and that was a case where at least two specific individuals--and I didn't inquire any further--were called before an Examining Panel and told they owed the Agency money, and were told, in effect, "You want to pay this money

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

back if you want to get selected to the Career Staff." As I stated at the last meeting, I think this is NOT the proper way for the Agency to collect money. In one of the instances, at least, I understand there was some question as to the propriety of the debt. It is my feeling that if there are outstanding advances the Comptroller has his superior officer in the DD/S, the Head of the Career Service, myself, and, as a last resort, the Director, to collect the money, but I don't think we ought to get in a system--and I don't mean to be too acrimonious about it--but it does smack of the Cominform system, of calling somebody in and saying: "Ah ha, you have sinned. You ought to pay it back."

I think I agree, basically, Red--

MR. WHITE: Yes, except I don't think your information as to just what took place as to these two people is really accurate. I looked into it shortly after you called me. I think there were two individuals who took a very dim view of it, and you got their side of the story but not the other side. I was not present but I have talked to some of the people who were present.

MR. [ ]: There is a transcript of every word that day.

MR. WHITE: And I'm certainly satisfied that the conduct of the Examining Panel was not as reported to you.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I am not criticizing the conduct of the Panel, I am criticizing the system.

MR. WHITE: Insofar as the financial business is concerned, there is no reason why any office Head or Head of Career Service should not know about any person in his organization who is delinquent, if he is running a proper office.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: He should know.

MR. WHITE: What I am saying is this, that this is not a case of the office Head not having had opportunity to be informed of this before this came before an Examining Panel, because we have a system, and I think it is working fairly well, where in the case of an Area Division, to illustrate, if a man is more than 30 days delinquent a memorandum goes from the Chief, Finance Division, to the Chief of the Division; if it isn't collected within 60 days, it goes from the Comptroller to what used to be DD/P-Admin; and if not collected within 90 days it comes to me, and I take

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a it up with [ ] or Wisner. Now, whether or not the administrative officer, in the Office of Communications, for example, actually shows that to the Head of the Career Service, is something over which we don't have any control. But the information is supplied to the Office. I just want to correct the impression that I think has gotten around that this is the first time the employee knew about this, or the Head of the Career Service knew about it. And, also, if the information I get is accurate, there was no attempt whatever to imply to these people that if they didn't pay up right away they just would not be selected into the Career Staff. The Selection Board, as I understand it, had agreed that it was proper to solicit this information from the Comptroller, and that it should be taken into consideration in deciding whether or not to select the man into the Career Staff. As I understand it, these people were merely told that this information was on file, and if they cared to make a statement in connection with it, it would be welcomed, and I don't really see anything too far wrong with that.

\* MR. KIRKPATRICK: If they were chronically delinquent in accounting for funds or paying back funds to the Agency, yes, then I think that is legitimate, but I wasn't under the impression that any of these were chronic delinquents.

MR. SAUNDERS: Yes, they were.

25X1A9a MR. [ ]: The only ones that came before the Panel were the chronic delinquents.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then how would they get out of their own Career Services?

25X1A9a MR. [ ]: That I can't answer, Kirk.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is what I want to correct now. There is something wrong with our Career Service Boards and the Heads of our operating components if such persons are recommended by them for Career Service in the Agency.

25X1A9a MR. [ ]: May I continue to put on the record what each person said? - because I took great care to brief each person who came before the Panel, and a stenotype transcript was made of these hearings. I informed each person who came, of the procedure which the Selection Board had approved, that they would have an opportunity to tell the Panel if they had had any difficulty in making their accountings, if there were any reasons why they

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

had been delinquent for at least six months--because only those who were officially informed by the Comptroller of having been delinquent for six months were even cited by the Comptroller for consideration by the Examining Panel. Each person, in addition, was told that we were not in the slightest interested in auditing the account, not concerned with the amount of money, how it was spent or where it was spent, and that the only thing the Panel was interested in was whether or not there was any valid reason for their having been delinquent for at least six months.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, as I say, I think the offices or the Career Service Boards in this instance are equally culpable, because I don't think anybody who is chronically delinquent in accounting or paying back what money he owes, should be recommended by a Career Board, in good faith, for Agency Career Staff. And I don't think that we correct the situation by then putting the bear on the Panel's back to do it. I just think the Panel in those cases ought to bounce the thing right back to the Career Service.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: The Panel wouldn't know until they talked to the man to see whether he was really chronically delinquent. That was the point the Comptroller made, that he would provide the cold, hard facts but not evaluate the case. The Selection Board requested the Panel to evaluate it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Had any of these Career Service Boards taken it up with the man?

25X1A9a

MR. [ ] I don't believe they had.

MR. CAREY: The Career Service Boards didn't know anything about it.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: From the place where I sit I can't tell whether the Career Boards had taken it up with the Panel or not.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is what I am getting at. I think the basic Career Boards should get this information.

MR. WHITE: It's a failure within the office someplace.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It's a failure of the administrative officer not telling the office chiefs or the Career Boards.

MR. WHITE: They do have the information.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ] Our Board doesn't.

MR. WHITE: You are organized in the DD/P so your administrative command structure doesn't go right along with the Board. But it is in each Area Division, Gordon, so it could be obtained.

~~SECRET~~



~~SECRET~~

MR. CAREY: The Director of Personnel and all of us at the Selection Board meeting were amazed that we even had people who were delinquent.

MR. SAUNDERS: The information goes to the administrative officers.

MR. WHITE: We could change like that [indicated by snapping fingers].

MR. CAREY: It was changed two months ago, so in future cases--

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: But aren't all of these questions, and I grant you they are in varying degrees of importance or priority--or whatever words you want to use--but anything involving an employee's standing, behavior, relations with the Agency, and all the rest of it, isn't that a matter which legitimately and properly should be passed to the head of the unit to which the man belongs, rather than to one of the staff members? After all, you can't absolve the head of the unit from responsibility to people. There is no staff device yet invented by man to do that appropriately. And, therefore, any of these things--whether he be ill, slightly deranged, whether it be that he gets drunk all the time, whether this, that, or the other thing--seems to me to be something that properly should be brought to the attention of the top man in charge of that unit, and something that he, as a responsible chief, should interest himself in. He has to have time for these matters.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I agree with you completely, Dick. Let me take a case now which will never get to the Career Boards, but we are right in the middle of it, a case of a former Agency employee who apparently was very heavily inclined toward drink throughout his Agency career, and--so help me--not a single one of his supervisors in the various offices he was in--and he was in three different offices--ever went on the record to the effect that this fellow drank heavily, until the time comes that it becomes an issue between the Agency and the individual, and then suddenly everybody remembers he is a heavy drinker. That is a very good example of how not to run a railroad, in my mind. I consider those particular offices all culpable in this particular case, and I certainly think that their testimony at this date is subject to question, because they never went on the record. I think the same thing is true as far as individuals coming up for Career Staff nomination is concerned. This is the time when if there is anybody

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

that has any information on individuals to the effect that they are heavy drinkers, talk too much at cocktail parties, or anything like that, it should come to light, but it should come to light to the Head of the Career Service and the Head of the Operating Component, and not up to some Examining Panel. I don't want to underestimate or under-judge the Examining Panels in any degree--I think they are important to get a cross-section and Agency viewpoint, it's a good leveling mechanism and I think we want to retain it--but I do think we want to get out of this system, which I feel is double jeopardy to the individual, and, also, is bringing to light, Red--and this is no reflection on you--some of our administrative weaknesses in the Agency in handling people.

MR. WHITE: As far as I am concerned, I certainly don't disagree at all that these things should come to the attention of the head of the component. If we have been delinquent in addressing them to a staff officer instead of the head of the component, we can correct that as of now.

MR. SAUNDERS: That has been done, Red.

MR. WHITE: I do think, though, Kirk, that unless the Career Service Head and the Selection Board act on the same set of facts, you are going to get wide variations in judgment. I believe the Panel has experienced one case like that already, where the Head of a Career Service approved a man being selected in and the Panel disagreed, because they had some knowledge that he [the Head of the Career Service] knew about, but it had slipped by, and when they conferred with him he agreed. So one fellow may say, "Well, this fellow has been drunk for the past nine years but he was sober part of the time so I am going to keep him." Now the other fellow might say, "I know he was drunk one day last week, so I don't want him." Unless your Selection Board has the same information to act upon, that the Head of the Career Service does--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: One of the reasons I think this meeting is important today is to work out that procedure, and to examine here, where we have everybody concerned, exactly what would happen if we say, "The Head of a Career Service recommends for Career Service an individual who has something in the Security or Medical or the IG or Comptroller files that is derogatory." Now it seems to me if he is going to recommend against that derogatory information, he should so state in making that recommendation,

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

and then see if the information can't be made available to the Selection Panel. I'd like to hear what Sheff [Edwards] and John [Tietjen] have to say on that.

MR. WHITE: To save a minute or two, since five of these seven offices of record are in the DD/S area, I might say that I met with Sheff, Dr. Tietjen and Harry [Reynolds] yesterday afternoon to talk about this, and I think I might save some time by trying to summarize what they thought about it.

First of all, to dispense with the Comptroller part of it--as I indicated earlier, I think all of the information which the Comptroller has to contribute to this certainly should be available to the office head. There isn't any question about that. It can be made available, and we are more than delighted to do that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Maybe this will serve to sharpen up the office heads.

MR. WHITE: I also felt that anything the Office of Training would have would be in the way of training evaluations and would be automatically furnished the component. So that is no problem. And it is furnished, also, on a continuing basis.

Now in talking to Sheff and Dr. Tietjen and Harry, they all felt that it is entirely appropriate--as a matter of fact, felt they were doing it right now, to a pretty substantial extent, at any rate, for them to furnish the office head information, not necessarily at the time that he was being considered for selection into the Career Service but at the time an event comes up which the Career Service Head or head of the component should have, that they feel it is entirely proper and are perfectly willing to do it, and feel they are doing it right now. So that all of that would take place without regard to whether or not the man was being considered for membership in the Career Staff. They did feel, however, with regard to a specific examination of every file at the time a man was selected or being considered for selection, that that would impose a pretty substantial administrative burden upon them which they couldn't do without additional help; and it also seemed to us that if they did the first properly--supply information as it became available--that it wouldn't be necessary to do the latter. And in view of the statistics which you all have in front of you now, it would

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

seem that to increase T/O's or to impose an additional administrative burden wouldn't be warranted because of the very limited number of cases in which there has been any disagreement at all. And so we rather felt that if these offices of record did furnish this information to office heads at the time it became available, that it wouldn't be necessary to have a systematic examination and supply information to some 15 or 20 boards and panels at the time they were considering each individual case, and that they could continue to supply the information which they had in the past, to the Panels, and that if there was any question in a case then, before it was formally considered, the Office Head would be told, "Something has come up here which we wonder if you knew about when you recommended this", and in that way it would be satisfactorily resolved without the Panel considering facts which the office head didn't have available to him at that time. I think that is a fairly accurate summation of what we thought.

We also felt that, whether written or not, it should certainly be understood that this information, particularly Security and Medical information, which is supplied to an office head, should not be disseminated to the boards or disseminated to other people unless the Doctor or the Security Officer concurred in a particular case.

MR. CAREY: But supposing something on the Medical side or the Security side would come directly to me. I couldn't very well weigh the matter without talking to the Division Chief, who knew more about it, what its value was, and so on.

25X1A9a MR. [ ]: That is an undertaking you have, in any event, George, career service aside.

MR. WHITE: If Sheff gave the information to you, for example--if it were Sheff's information, then you could agree with him, at that time, in that case, how far you could go. In some cases you wouldn't want it to go very far.

25X1A9a MR. [ ]: The same procedure is going to obtain irrespective of whether this man is up for Career Service. Maybe there is something you have to do about the employee.

MR. CAREY: But in the past on security matters Sheff called me to tell me about security problems. If somebody has to be called off

~~SECRET~~

classified work, I would know about it.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: We are talking about the employee where it isn't so derogatory that he would have to be let out of the Agency.

MR. EDWARDS: I think we can live very well within the terms of that agenda as written.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: It might be useful to go back and check the purposes of these offices of record. This was discussed at some length at the Selection Board, and they decided to do so against objections raised by myself and various others. The reason that decision was made was that you may have an indication from one set of records or from one area that a fellow is pretty good, and you may have an indication that he is not very good, but at no time do we pull all these various bits and pieces of the picture together and make a total assessment. That was essentially Matt Baird's position, and the position the Board took. Now it isn't going to do any good to say the various offices of record will from time to time advise a supervisor, because the material that you advise the supervisor about just doesn't get into that person's personnel file, and it properly shouldn't. For example, the Training people withhold a very considerable amount of material from the files that are passed around for personnel purposes; and Security certainly doesn't enter material into your general personnel files. So the purpose of this particular check, and the thing the Selection Board agreed upon was to give the various offices of record a chance to come up at one time and see if there wasn't a picture or a profile, or something about an individual which you wouldn't know unless you called them all up at the same time. Now, if we can't meet that particular requirement, then I don't see that there is much sense in worrying about offices of record at this time.

MR. CAREY: Well, if this procedure is followed that all these offices of record report these things to the Career Boards, I don't see any need for any Panels. All they would be is rubber stamps.

MR. WHITE: Of course, in the case of Security and Medical I didn't want to create the impression, if I did, that the file in either case would be available to the office head or the Board, but if there was information which in the judgment of the Security Office or the Medical Office would influence, in any way, how you used a man--not necessarily just

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

whether he should be in Career Service, but if a man has some physical limitation, for instance, that would prohibit his being used in certain areas, then the Doctor has an obligation to tell the head of that office. Now whether in consideration of that medical finding the head of the office thinks that affects adversely his selection into the Career Service, is something for the head of that component to judge.

MR. CAREY: But based on what Kirk proposes--he says the Panel is too low to deal with the cases--then what is the Panel going to do except rubber stamp recommendations for category "A"? Then we might as well get rid of them.

MR. WHITE: There's another point--I might speak to that--that I think is most important. I think that what I had understood we were trying to get at was to have the office or component Career Board and the Selection Panel consider the same set of facts. I think it's fairly important to our employees not to be changing horses in the middle of the stream. We do an awful lot of wavering back and forth. We have a procedure set up here which is working but which perhaps should be modified to meet that point. But I think it might have a very adverse affect upon employee morale if, having put 1460, or whatever it is, through one procedure, we should suddenly say, "Well, this is all changed now. Let's have an entirely new procedure." So I for one would hope that we wouldn't do away with the Selection Board or Panels, but, rather, take steps to see that the office head or Career Service head is considering the same information that the Panel is considering, at the time he makes his recommendation.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I agree with you, Red, for two reasons--I agree with your reason but I have two additional reasons. One reason is that I think these Panels will give us a much better leveling basis, so that the offices across the board use the same criteria for selection, which I think is important; and, secondly, because I think the Selection Panels are going to be darned important in the future in selecting in new employees coming into CIA. That is where I see them evolving into importance. And then, laterally, as soon as we get through this massive exercise, into selecting employees under various criteria, for promotion--maybe not actually promotions as such, but selecting into the Senior Executive Inventory, the

~~SECRET~~

Junior Executive Inventory, Specialist Panels, etc. But it seems to me all we have to do is twist the knob slightly here, which is what we are doing, and I think whether we achieve anything else, it will tighten up our whole procedure by getting the right information to the operating component chiefs. And then it would be my impression--I think this procedure is practically all right as written here, but I would recommend that in paragraph b on page 2 - ". . . to the extent that it is professionally appropriate and operationally secure . . ." -"will furnish to the CIA Selection Board, and simultaneously advise the head of the operating component" that they are so doing.

25X1A9a

MR.  Right.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then we get everybody on the same wicket. Information concerning the work performance--now actually my instinct is to put it the other way around and say that the head of the operating component will advise the CIA Selection Board of information available in one of these seven offices of record. Whether that is practical or not, I don't know.

MR. WHITE: To leave it this way does give you a check system, that if they complied with the first part of this, they have already furnished it to the offices, and this gives you a check to make sure it hasn't been missed.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It's certainly going to make the staffs and offices a lot more alert in making sure the information is furnished to the operating components, because it would seem to me that if I had something concerning an individual that was of sufficient importance to call it to the attention of the head of the operating component, whether he was up for Career Service at that moment or not, it is always appropriate to say whether we think this man is a career candidate.

25X1A9a

MR.  And it is important that it be said at the time the man is up for selection. That is why I am against the idea these things are dropped in the files, because there aren't any files--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It will be many years before our files will be the way they should be.

25X1A9a

MR.  These files are handed up and down the halls for recruitment purposes.

~~SECRET~~

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We should have a double set of files.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ] You do, in effect, because you have the Security, Medical files, and so on, which are in effect double files. All we are doing now is trying to draw on them.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, I have dealt an awful lot with the Medical and Security offices and I think the way they handle their files is the way it should be handled. Only one individual's file has ever been out of my office and that went to an Employment Review Board.

MR. REYNOLDS: Then you would add in here after the words "CIA Selection Board" - "simultaneously to the head of the operating component."

Gentlemen, if you will, please note this change suggested by the Inspector General. Have you any comments to make?

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: Sending it to the head of the component doesn't do our Board very much good.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: That is very true in the DD/P.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: And/or head of the Career Service.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: If it is simultaneously sent to the head of the Career Service could not the head of the Career Service see that it gets to the line commander. "To the head of the Career Service", then, instead of the operating component? Is that the way it is?

MR. REYNOLDS: And/or.

MR. WHITE: In the DD/P where you have a problem they both ought to know it; I mean, the Division Chief should know.

MR. REYNOLDS: Isn't "and/or" supposed to be very bad English?

MR. CAREY: This is certainly going to take 50% of the work off the Panels and put it on the Selection Board.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: There is one point I think we ought to consider in

25X9A2

this, and that is that over [ ] applications have already gone through the Career Service Boards. We sent them all back once--in December. There

25X9A2

are [ ] applications that have already gone through the Career Services; in other words, about 70% have already gone through. So procedure that affects the Career Service Boards now, is either going to mean that these should go back to the Boards for re-examination, or else is it to catch the remaining 30%, Kirk?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Not to be retroactive.

~~SECRET~~



~~SECRET~~

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No. Put it into effect now. Don't touch those, and leave it up to the seven offices of record to catch any of those by virtue of your lists being disseminated.

25X1A9a MR. [ ]: Another point--which I so sincerely feel--here are only 26 cases in which there was some disagreement between the Career Service and the Selection Board, and/or the Examining Panel. In other words, one and 8/10 percent of the whole. Now in every case the Career Service was immediately informed as soon as the Selection Board evaluated the information--the Career Service was immediately informed of this same information, Kirk, so the Panels and the Selection Board mechanism, in a sense, serve to field a fast one that got past one of the Career Services and then immediately informed that Career Service of that fact.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is all right. I think when we get through with this particular operation the heads of the Career Services are going to know a lot more about their people.

MR. REYNOLDS: Any questions on this?

25X1A9a MR. [ ]: To what extent, Rud, do you have information from the offices of record on this 70% not yet scheduled to go before a Panel?

25X1A9a MR. [ ]: Well, [ ] cases have been scheduled, and that 25X9A2 would leave [ ] that have not yet gone to the seven offices of record. Now I believe, from having worked with those offices - principally Security, Medical and Personnel - that it would be impossible to handle more than about 150 a week, because otherwise the whole machinery gets clogged with a tremendous workload. That is why we schedule about 150 a week.

25X1A9a MR. [ ]: How much of a lag is there between when you get this information and the Panels meet?

25X1A9a X MR. [ ]: Approximately there is a maximum of 30 days' lag.

25X1A9a MR. [ ]: When the head of a Career Service learns something about him. We, then, can take a new look--

25X1A9a MR. [ ]: Paragraph 2a will do that, because at the same time I schedule a case I will likewise inform, say Dr. Guthe, that 50 of his men are coming up within 30 days, so he can be alert to the fact that these are on the "front burner", so to speak--these 50 cases.

MR. CAREY: What good is that going to do him?

25X1A9a MR. [ ]: I am interested in the derogatory information getting

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

to the Career Service where a Panel had not yet met. I don't see why that can't be done. You are getting it up to 30 days in advance.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: On some of it I get it the day before the Panel meets. It comes in on varying kinds of a schedule. We can't guarantee 30 days beforehand. Now the Panel evaluates this information and if it is inconsequential or doesn't make a picture which is derogatory, then the Panel either disregards it or it will recommend to the Selection Board, "Here is something for the Selection Board to be concerned with". Every piece of information that comes in I don't believe you would want passed on because it would be a large volume, sometimes, of information which is not germane to the problem. Do you see what I mean? In other words, until it is all put together--

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: The office of record hereafter will provide the office head with this derogatory information. In the meantime you will already have received some information that you are holding for a Panel. I don't know how much there is, but apparently there is considerable. I don't see why some action can't be taken to notify an office head of that material.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It would seem to me they would automatically do that, Gene.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: There will be a phasing of a couple of weeks, yes. For example, today I received from the Office of Training word that the Office of Training wishes to orally present some information on a certain case at this particular Panel meeting. Now, as a matter of phasing this thing, I can so inform that Office that that will be done. However, it must be recognized that that Office will have its own examiner on the Panel when that Panel meets--at that time, you see--but I won't know, until they come and present it, what the information is that will be presented by the Assessment Staff in the Office of Training. Do you see what I mean? It is an "alert", as it were, that there is some information which should be considered because it might have a bearing, you see; but when the Panel has finished evaluating it they may say it has no bearing on this.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: I would like to raise another question here in the case of the Office of Training, where there is considerable traffic back and forth between one component and another, with personnel moving back and forth. Now, some of this seems to be based on the supposition that people

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~ ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

stay in one component. For instance, if in the Office of Training we find there is a man in DD/P that we want--the head of the Career Service over there has had this derogatory information that is very sensitive, and he's the only one that knows it--so we pick this fellow up, and after we have had him for awhile he converts his career designation to Training, and the first time that Baird would know about this would be--well, when Baird knows about it.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: Included in these 26 cases are three or four of that type, where an individual transferred from one component to another, and some important information was in the original component that hadn't gone along to the gaining component.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: Isn't that an administrative matter, and not related to Career Service?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The gaining component should acquaint themselves with the background of it.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: It's up to the people transferring a man to make that material available to you. And hell, this is famous in this Agency--this business of sloughing people off, putting the information in "File 13", and not letting the new office know about it. It has been going on so long it has become masterful. But I don't believe there is any device known to man that will entirely whip it, until you get ready to play ball here.

MR. REYNOLDS: That is exactly it, Dick, expressed beautifully and succinctly. I am glad to have you say it just like that.

MR. WHITE: May I add one point? I would like to suggest, again, that a paragraph 3 be incorporated, which would provide that personnel to whom this information is furnished, would further disseminate it only with the concurrence of the Security Office--the originating office.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: A new paragraph 3.

MR. CAREY: And also put in there that it will not be kept in the files of the Career Service Board concerned but will be returned to the originating office, so we don't have a lot of sensitive files on people building up in every part of the Agency.

DR. GUTHE: Harry, I would like to clarify one point in my own mind. As I understand it, this will mean quite a change as to the responsibilities of the Career Service Boards, because as I recall the instructions

~~SECRET~~~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

that were given to the Career Service Boards from the Selection Board, they were to evaluate these people on the basis of their performance on the job, on the basis of their obvious conduct, but we were not expected to check with all of these offices of record to see if they had something against these individuals, and it was the Examining Panel that was supposed to catch that. So now you are changing those instructions somewhat in that the Career Service Boards, or at least the head of the component, will receive that kind of information from the record offices and that will be part of the information on which they judge the individual. So the Career Service Board or the head of the component will have a greater responsibility in judging the individual than he has had up to this time.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is right.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: This special, pin-point information will come to the Head of the Career Service after he has made his recommendation, you see, when this case comes up. It's once in time and space this decision is being made in regard to the individual. The offices of record are alerted on the schedule of approximately 150 cases a week--because that is all they can handle--and they examine those particular problems. At that time they will send to the Selection Board, as well as to you, any information which they may have. That is the reason I proposed this paragraph 2a. You will then know that, let's say, 50 of your people are scheduled within two weeks, and at the same time the Security Office or the Medical Office, or any one of the seven offices of record, will send to you the same information they are sending to the Panel, so that you can revise your judgment about that individual. That is the way I see it working.

DR. GUTHE: We will judge an individual on a broader basis than in the past.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: You can take a second look just prior to this basic decision.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: Who gets that information to the Career Service people?

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: It would come from [ ], I presume, as it comes to me--

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: In other words, Security will give you one copy and give us one.

25X1A9a

MR. [ ]: Some of it, of course, is orally presented. Now

~~SECRET~~~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

I don't know how you can handle the oral presentations except to let the Panel evaluate it and then flip it to the Career Services.

MR. EDWARDS: As a rule, the rule has been that if it's from our Office it's oral. Then I would vote on the Panel calling on us for more information when they met, but for fear of registering what would turn out to be a false allegation--it's quite a precaution there, for the benefit of the employee.

MR. WHITE: Both in the case of Security and Medical we don't want memoranda floating around about people.

MR. REYNOLDS: Then, gentlemen, will the Council approve the wording suggested by the Inspector General that after the words "CIA Selection Board" the following is added: "...and simultaneously to the Head of the Career Service concerned and/or the Head of the operating component." And, No. 2, a paragraph 3 as stated by the Deputy Director of Support?

. . . This motion was so made and carried . . .

MR. REYNOLDS: Any further business to come before the Council? If not, the meeting stands adjourned.

. . . The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m. . . .

[Immediately following this meeting Mr. White and Mr.  worded paragraph 3 as follows:

25X1A9a

"3. Any additional dissemination of the information supplied pursuant to paragraphs 1 and 2 above, will be limited to that concurred in by the originating office of record." ]

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~